

REMARKS

The Office Action rejected claims 22-38 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action further objected to claim 39 as depending on a rejected claim. More specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 22-38 under the obviousness-type doubling patenting doctrine over U.S. Patent No. 6,323,735.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the double-patenting rejection of claims 22-38 and the objection to claim 39. To expedite the issuance of the claims, however, the Applicants file concurrently with this paper a Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Double Patenting Rejection Over a Prior Patent (*i.e.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,323,735, cited above). The Applicants respectfully submit that the terminal disclaimer overcomes the rejection of claims 22-38. Furthermore, the terminal disclaimer renders moot the objection to claim 39. The Applicants therefore submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 22-39 are in allowable condition. Favorable reconsideration and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed to be due, however, should any fees under 37 CFR 1.16-1.21 be required for any reason relating to the enclosed materials, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from Deposit Account No. 10-1205/SILA:106.

The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Maximilian R. Peterson
Registration No. 46,469
Attorney for Applicant

O'KEEFE, EGAN & PETERMAN
1101 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building C, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 347-1611
FAX: (512) 347-1615